	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
First Action Interview Pilot Program Pre-Interview Communication	10/594,711	OKUYAMA ET AL.	
Pre-interview Communication	Examiner	Art Unit	Page 1 of 1
	AMANDA BARROW	1795	
-The MAILING OR NOTIFICATION DATE of this communica	ntion appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspond	dence address -
THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING OR NO			
This time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFF This communication constitutes notice under 37 CFF		nal MONTH.	
Applicant must, within the time period for reply, file: (1) A under 37 CFR 1.111 waiving the first action interview and Interview Request Form (PTOL-413A) electronically via E arguments, and schedule the interview within 2 months for communication will be treated as a request not to have a Action, the instant Pre-Interview Communication is deem Office action may be made final if appropriate. See MPE	d First Action Interview Office Act EFS-Web, accompanied by a pro rom the filing of the request. A fa n interview. If applicant waives t led the first Office Action on the N	ion; or (3) An App posed amendmer illure to respond to he First Action Int	olicant Initiated nt or to this erview Office
Disposition of Claims			
3)⊠ Claim(s) <u>48, 50-52, 54-65, 67, 69, 71 and 72</u> is	lare pending in the application.		
3a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
4)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>48, 51, 52, 54-65, 67, 69, 71 and 72</u> is	s/are rejected.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>50</u> is/are objected to.			
7)☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
8) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
9)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2006 is/a	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objec	ted to by the Exar	mine r .
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o			FR 1.121(d).
10)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P7	ΓΟ-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
11)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau	•	ed in this National	Stage
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	ne certified copies not received.		
Contact Information			
Examiner's Telephone Number: (571)270-7867			
Examiner's Typical Work Schedule: 7:30am-5pm	EST. Monday-Friday, alternate Frida	ays off	
Supervisor's Name: Dah-Wei Yuan			
Supervisor's Telephone Number: 571-272-1295			
Attachment(s)			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413FP (Rev. 07-09)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/28/06.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

First Action Interview Pilot Program Pre-Interview Communication

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10594711	OKUYAMA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit	Page 2 of 2	
AMANDA BARROW	1795		

Notification of Rejection(s) and/or Objection(s)

1	Notification of Rejection(s) and/or Objection(s)				
#	Claim(s)	Reference(s) (if applicable)	Rejection Statutory Basis	Brief Explanation of Rejection	
1	48, 52, 67, 69, 72	A, U	102 (b)	A teaches a hydrogen generating stack 12 that decomposes fuel such as methanol (p 16 & 34). A channel introdcues MeOH/H2O to the anode 16 and protons and water are transported across the PEM to cathode side 20 of the cell. The protons are reduced along the cathode by externally	
2	54-56, 58 and 65	A, U	103 (a)	A teaches that operating the electrolyzer at atm. pressure allows for use of lower current densities without a decrease in efficiency by distributing the same amount of electrocatalyst over a larger membrane surface, resulting in a higher voltage effiency of	
3	71	A, U, B	102 (b)	A teaches that a sodium sulfate electrolyzer can be used wherein sodium sulfate/sulfuric acid is supplied ot the anode as fuel. B gives evidence that in such an electrolysis cell, a hydrogen peroxide solution migrates across the membrane (p 5). Thus, in this	
4	59-64	A, C, D, E	103 (a)	A fails to teach that the voltage/evolution volume of H2 is adjusted by parameters claimed; however, C teaches that the amount of hydrogen can be varied depending on the power provided (paragraph 35), D teaches that the volume of H2 varies depending on the	
5	51, 56, 57		112, 1st paragraph	Claims 51 and 57 fail to fulfill the enablement requirement of 112, 1st paragraph. It is not clear to the Examiner how the hydrogen generating device can withdraw electric energy to outside as this goes against all standard operating parameters of a hydrogen	

Expanded Discussion/Commentary				
6	Claim 50 is is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 50 is allowable because the prior art does not teach that the hydrogen generating device is an open circuit having neither means for withdrawing electric energy to outside from a hydrogen generating cell constituting the hydrogen generating device, nor means for providing electric energy from outside to the hydrogen generating cell.			
1	transported electrons to form hydrogen, thus, the protons supplied act as the "oxidizing agent" which is defined as a species that gains electrons as evidenced by U. Figure 1 shows "hydrogen supply means" (pipe labeled "generated H2") and hydrogen storing means 14. A teaches that water transported across the PEM is in vapor/gas form and thus the water ("oxidizing agent') is an O2 containing gas (claim 69). The MEA membrane is an ionic conductive membrane formed of perflurocarbon sulfonic acid (p 19) (claim 72).			
2	the electrolyzer (p 8). It is well known that current and voltage are related through Ohm's law (V= IR). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the current density (and thus the voltage) by modifying the amount of electro-catalyst and area of membrane surface in order to arrive at the desired efficency of the electrolyzer. The discovery of an optimum value of a known result effective variable, without producing any new or unexpected results, is within the ambit of a person of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215.			
3	case, the "oxidizing agent" supplied to the cathode in the electrolyzer of A is a hydrogen peroxide solution			
volume/concentration of the reactants (paragraph 35), and E teaches that the voltage of the cell is varied according to the concentration (and thus the volume as the two are related) of the reactants (column 5, lines 19-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify these parameters in the hydrogen generating device of A in order to achieve the desired voltage/evolution of H2 in order to satisfy the systems needs (i.e., the amount of hydrogen required by the fuel cell).				
5	generating devices. If electricity is being withdrawn, it appears as though the "H2 generating device" is actually functioning as a fuel cell as typically devices of this sort, often deemed electrolysis cells, require energy to operate and do not produce energy. Appropriate correction or explanation is required.			
DATE : 6/29/2010		/AMANDA BARROW/ Examiner, Art Unit 1795	/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795	